

REMARKS:

In the foregoing amendments, claims 1-4 were canceled, and claims 5-10 were added to be to the application. In addition, the abstract of the disclosure was amended within the range of 50 to 150 words, while excluding form and legal phraseology and implied language. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests that the examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection to the abstract of the disclosure as set forth the outstanding Office action.

At the top of page 2, the Official action set forth an objection to the drawings. The Official action stated that an intermediate rocking lever link and the link mechanism must be shown in the drawings or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). New claims 5-8 do not include the expression "link mechanism," which was objected to in the Office action, but rather include the expression "mechanism." This latter expression is set forth in applicant's specification disclosure. New claims 5-8 do not include the expression "intermediate rocking lever link, " which was objected to in the outstanding Office action. All the other terms and expressions used in new claims 5-8 are described in applicant's specification disclosure. For these reasons, applicant respectfully requests that the examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection to the drawings as set forth in the outstanding Office action.

Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which is not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is

most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The Official action questioned the meaning of the expression "link mechanism." New claims 5-8 do not contain this expression. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests that the examiner reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Official action set forth a number of reasons for this rejection. New claims 5-8 respond to all the reasons set forth in the outstanding Office action. Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 5-8 particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests that the examiner reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese 1-145430 of Yoshimura in view of U.S. patent No. 3,780,842 of Whipple *et al.* (Whipple). The statement of this rejection is set forth from the bottom of page 4 through the middle of page 6 of the Official action.

Applicant respectfully submits that the teachings of Yoshimura and Whipple do not disclose or suggest the structure of the presently claimed invention as set forth in claims 5-10. Please refer to Fig. 4 of Yoshimura. As shown therein, equal radius parts 23a and 23b are provided in both ends of the cam groove 23 in the member A. In the range where a roller 26 of the

member B engages these equal radius parts 23a, 23b, the member B obtains no movement. In other words, in the intermediate portion of the cam groove 23, there is movement of member B; but at the end portions of the cam groove 23, there is no movement of member B.

On the other hand, in the presently claimed invention, movement between the locking lever and the control lever is provided along the rocking stroke up to the intermediate point of the rocking stroke and after the intermediate point there is no responsive motion. Thus, the structure and movement corresponding thereto, as required in applicant's claims, is different from that proposed by Yoshimura. For this reason, the teachings of Yoshimura cannot motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to the invention as set forth in the present claims.

With respect to the teachings of Whipple, the Official action noted column 5, lines 51-61, of these teachings. It is respectfully noted that these teachings of Whipple are opposite to those of Yoshimura. As shown, for example, in Fig. 5 of Whipple, the throttle cam 61 has a roller 63 that travels along a transfer portion 67 of groove 61 without displacing the throttle arm 43. However, the roller 63 when entering one of the extended end portions 69 and 71 of groove 61 advances the throttle. In other words, the teachings of Whipple propose no relative movement of the control lever relative to the throttle within a central portion, but relative movement at the end portions of the groove 61. Since the teachings of Whipple propose a movement that is opposite to that

proposed by Yoshimura, applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to substitute motion from one of Yoshimura and Whipple into the other of Yoshimura and Whipple with any expectation of success. For such reasons, applicant respectfully submits that the combined teachings of Yoshimura and Whipple cannot negate the patentability of the presently claimed invention.

More importantly, neither Yoshimura nor Whipple propose the arrangements set forth in claim 5 where a locking lever and the linkage provide a rocking stroke for operating the locking lever, the linkage including an idle motion stroke mechanism for switching the control selection lever between the controllable and uncontrollable states at a midpoint of the rocking stroke of the locking lever and for idling the control selection lever between the midway point of the rocking stroke and a first end point of the rocking stroke of the locking lever.


For the foregoing reasons, applicant respectfully submits that the invention is set forth in present claims 5-8 is distinguishable from the teachings of Yoshimura and Whipple. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests that examiner reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

The foregoing is believed to be a complete and proper response to the Official action mailed February 27, 2003. While it is believed that all the claims in this application are in condition for allowance, should the examiner have any comments or questions, it is respectfully requested that the

undersigned be telephoned at the below listed number to resolve any outstanding issues.

In the event this paper is not timely filed, applicant hereby petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The fee therefor, as well as any other fees which become due, may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 22-0256.

Respectfully submitted,
VARNDELL & VARNDELL, PLLC
(Formerly Varndell Legal Group)


R/ Eugene Varndell, Jr.
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 29,728

Atty. Case No. VX022386
106-A S. Columbus St.
Alexandria, VA 22314
(703) 683-9730

\\V:\VDOCS\W_DOCS\MAY03\PO-152-2408 RS.DOC